REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the final Office Action mailed October 6, 2008. The status of the application is as follows:

- Claims 1-11 and 14-21 are pending, claims 1-11 have been amended, and claims 14-21 have been added;

- Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brookes et al. (US 2004/0059575) in view of Martino et al. (US 6,061,646); and

- Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brookes et al. in view of Martino et al. and in further view of Lee et al. (US 2002/0087306).

The rejections are discussed below.

Preliminary Matters

Claims 1-11 have been amended for informalities and not to address issues of patentability.

The Rejection of Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brookes et al. in view of Martino et al. This rejection should be withdrawn because the subject claims have been amended to include additional limitations not found in the prior art.

Amended independent **claim 1** is directed to a speech recognition device including, *inter alia*, a second language-property recognizer **that uses the speech information and the first property information to recognize a second language property of the speech information and to generate second property information representing the recognized second language property.** The combination of Brookes et al. in view of Martino et al. does not teach or suggest the emphasized claim aspect.

The Office concedes that Brookes et al. does not teach second language-property recognition means use the speech information to recognize a second language property of the speech information and to generate second property information representing the recognized

second language property. In an attempt to make up for this conceded deficiency, the Office asserts that Martino et al. teaches this claim aspect (col. 10, lines 58-65; Figure 4). However, claim 1 has been amended to further require that at least a second language-property recognizer uses the speech information and the first property information to recognize a second language property of the speech information. Neither Brookes et al. nor Martino et al. teach or suggest this claim aspect.

Particularly, Martino et al. fails to teach that the disclosed language-property recognition means uses the first property information recognized by the speech recognition system in Brookes et al. to recognize a language property of the speech information and to generate second property information as required by claim 1. Rather, Martino et al. teaches a system that uses speech recognition engines 161-168 that recognizes which language has been spoken into a microphone (col. 10, lines 18-20 and 58-65).

Each speech recognition engine 161-168 is equipped with a plurality of small dictionaries each for respective one of the plurality of languages (claim 1). Each dictionary includes speech data for a selected few common words for each language (claim 1). One of the plurality of languages is selected as the language of a detected utterance based on a number of recognized words for each language from the small dictionaries (claim 1). The detected utterance is then recognized using a large dictionary for the language of the detected utterance (claim 1). The system then responds to the user in the selected language (claim 1). Hence, Martino fails to teach that speech recognition engines 161-168 use the first property information to recognize the language of the detected utterance as required by claim 1.

Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 3-5 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency.

Independent **claims 6 and 11** have been amended to include claim aspects similar to those added to claim 1. As such, the above discussion with respect to claim 1 applies *mutatis mutandis* to claims 6 and 11, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 8-10 depend from claim 6 and are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency.

The Rejection of Claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brookes et al. in view of Martino et al., and further in view of Lee et al. **Claims 2 and 7** depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency.

New Claims 14-21

Newly added claims 14-21 emphasize various aspects. No new matter has been added. The aspects in these claims are absent from the prior art. Entry and allowance of claims 14-21 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims distinguish patentably and non-obviously over the prior art of record. An early indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Corrigan

Michael J. Corrigan, Reg. No. 42,440
Driggs, Hogg, Daugherty & Del Zoppo Co., L.P.A.
38500 Chardon Road
Willoughby Hills, Ohio 44094
Phone: 1.440.391.5100
Fax: 1.440.391.5101

Direct all correspondence to:
Yan Glickberg, Reg. No. 51,742
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
595 Miner Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44143
Phone: 1.440.483.3455
Fax: 1.914.323.0615